

Remarks

Support for the claims as amended

Claims 5 and 15

Support for the language in claims 5 and 15, “each database system of the plurality including a query engine and a database” may be found at least at 205 and 220 in FIG. 2 and page 10, lines 26 and 27: “Continuing in more detail with database system 203, like all database systems, database system 203 include a query engine 205 and a database 220.”

Support for the language in claim 5, “determining when the request is parsed whether an execution of the request is preferably done at least in part in another database system of the plurality” may be found at 301 in FIG. 3 and described at page 16, line 26-page 17, line 23.

That claim 15’s “request analyzer” and “redirector” are in the particular database system’s “query engine” is supported by FIG. 3, which presents details of query engine 205 and which shows “semantic analyzer” 305 and SQL redirector 307. The functions of these elements are disclosed at least at page 17, lines 13-23.

Claims 6 and 19

The language “a specifier referring to an object that is not present in the particular database system” is supported at page 7, line 6-page 8, line 5, which makes it clear what is meant by an object in a database system; that redirection occurs when “the object required for execution of the request is not present in the particular database system” is clear at least from the description of redirection at page 17, line 13-page 18 line 6.

How the amendments overcome the rejections

Claims 5 and 15

The BPAI’s rejection of independent claims 5 and 15 as anticipated by Bogantz is based on the BPAI’s determination that Applicants’ Specification did not limit the claim term

“distributed database system that includes a plurality of database systems” to a distributed database system in which each of the plurality of database systems has its own search engine and database. See pages 6 and 7 of the *Decision*. Applicants have now amended their claims to clearly set forth that limitation. Since Bogantz does not disclose a distributed database system in which “each database system of the plurality includ[es] a query engine and a database” (see page 7, paragraph 3 of the *Decision*), the claim as amended is not anticipated by Bogantz and the amendment overcomes the rejection of claims 5 and 15 and all of the claims dependent from claims 5 and 15.

Claims 6 and 19

Applicants have amended these claims to make it clear that one of cases in which redirection occurs is when the query includes a reference to an object which is not present in the particular database. The amendment thus clearly distinguishes the redirection set forth in claims 6 and 19 from the redirection which occurs in Bogantz when the object is present in the database but its *value* is being updated. Indeed, the entire redirection technique of Bogantz *requires* that the object that is being updated is present in the data base, since it is a data item *in the object* which indicates that the object’s value is being updated. See in this regard col. 6, line 42-col. 7, line 10.

Conclusion

Applicants have demonstrated that their amended claims are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and have further demonstrated that the claims as amended overcome the rejections that were affirmed by the BPAI. Since that is the case, the foregoing *Submission* satisfies the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.111(b) and therefore of 37 C.F.R. 1.114(c). Applicants consequently respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the finality of the rejection, enter the amendment, and continue with the examination, as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.114(d). The requisite *Request for Continued Examination* and fee accompany this *Submission*.

Respectfully submitted,
/Gordon E. Nelson/
Attorney of record,
Gordon E. Nelson
57 Central St., P.O. Box 782

Rowley, MA, 01969,
Registration number 30,093
Voice: (978) 948-7632
Fax: (978) 945-5550
email: GNelson@
PatentGC.com
Date: April 9, 2010